Exhibit 10

```
J64WcitC1
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      CITY OF ALMATY, KAZAKHSTAN,
      et al.,
 4
                     Plaintiffs,
 5
                                               19 Civ. 2645 (AJN) (KHP)
                 v.
 6
      FELIX SATER,
 7
      et al.,
 8
                     Defendants.
                                                Conference
 9
                                                New York, N.Y.
10
                                                June 4, 2019
                                                2:30 p.m.
11
      Before:
12
                         HON. KATHARINE H. PARKER,
13
                                                U.S. Magistrate Judge
14
15
                                 APPEARANCES
16
      BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
           Attorneys for Plaintiffs
17
      BY: MATTHEW L. SCHWARTZ
           CRAIG A. WENNER
18
      TODD & LEVI LLP
           Attorneys for Defendants Sater, Ridloff,
19
           Bayrock Group, Global Habitat Solutions and RRMI-DR
20
      BY: DAVID B. ROSENBERG
21
      MICHAEL S. HORN
           Attorney for Defendant Ferrari Holdings
22
23
24
25
```

you think then, by how much time did plaintiffs --

MR. ROSENBERG: Well, the unjust enrichment claims, your Honor, as you can see from the pleading, all of the allegations which establish that claim occurred back in 2012 and 2013, according to the pleading filed by plaintiff. Unjust enrichment the statute of limitations is three years, so even by the face of plaintiffs' own pleading, those claims are time-barred.

THE COURT: Have you discussed this already with plaintiffs' counsel?

MR. ROSENBERG: We have not.

THE COURT: Have you looked into any tolling arguments or defenses they would have to the statute of limitations?

MR. ROSENBERG: We know that there are issues on the unjust enrichment claims, whether that statute of limitations may apply to either a six-year or three-year statute. Based on the underlying causes of action in this pleading we believe that the three-year statute applies.

THE COURT: Other bases for the motion?

MR. ROSENBERG: Finally, there will be a motion to dismiss based on a release signed by the plaintiffs in this case, and that motion will be based, will be filed only on behalf of defendant Felix Sater, who is the beneficiary of that release.

THE COURT: Are you referring to the release signed in

1 an agreement between Arcanum and plaintiff Mr. Sater? 2 MR. ROSENBERG: That's correct, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: And that's the subject of an arbitration 4 proceeding right now? 5 MR. ROSENBERG: The arbitration proceeding was commenced in order to collect fees owed to Mr. Sater under a 6 7 recovery assistance agreement. THE COURT: But isn't there a dispute as to the 8 9 enforceability of the release now that there's been an alleged 10 violation of the obligations under the contract? 11 MR. ROSENBERG: I'm not sure if there's a dispute 12 about the enforceability of the release. There may be a 13 dispute about the enforceability of the fees owed to Mr. Sater,

THE COURT: Right.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

commenced.

MR. ROSENBERG: I don't believe that there's any dispute about the enforceability of that release, which was effective as of the date it was signed.

obviously, which is why the arbitration proceeding was

THE COURT: OK. What was the consideration for that release?

MR. ROSENBERG: The assistance, I assume, provided by Mr. Sater. I mean there is a lot of consideration for that release, which is the subject of the arbitration proceeding.

The arbitration panel has just been appointed within the past

week or two.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: What's the schedule for that arbitration?

MR. ROSENBERG: I'm not exactly privy to the exact

schedule for that arbitration right now, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. ROSENBERG: But it's really just started.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. ROSENBERG: There's been no exchange of documents.

The panel was just appointed.

THE COURT: OK. And I see that you also are anticipating a motion related to disqualification of Boies Schiller.

MR. ROSENBERG: Yes, your Honor.

As the pleadings and the facts disclosed in the related proceeding show, Boies Schiller, as counsel for plaintiffs in this action, have a longstanding relationship with Mr. Sater. That relationship commenced in about 2015.

During that relationship Mr. Sater met with plaintiffs' counsel numerous times, exchanged numerous communications with plaintiffs' counsel, and I think as plaintiffs' counsel has said today, many of those discussions were tied to the recovery of assets against the defendants in the related proceeding and touched on possibly the assets and allegations in this case as well.

We don't know the full extent of those communications